

**Holifield Warns Test Ban Pact Bars
New Canal****EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. CRAIG HOSMER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, our able colleague from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] the vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has warned those taking euphoric views about a second interocean canal somewhere in Central America to get realistic. No new canal can be built without the use of nuclear explosives. No one nation, nor any combination of nations, is rich enough to build such a canal using only conventional earthmoving means. Yet, under the terms of the recently negotiated nuclear test ban treaty, Mr. Khrushchev's permission must be obtained for the use of nuclear explosives for this purpose. Any benevolent understanding on his part in this regard is highly unlikely. Deprivation of the free world's access to a second canal comes as no surprise. I pointed out this consequence over and over again before the treaty was ratified. So did many others. When this and other costs to the West for this ill-starred venture in diplomacy with the Reds is finally totaled, the aggregate will be startling. It should be sufficient to dispel the euphoria of even the treaty's most starry-eyed supporters.

The following interesting editorial comments regarding Mr. HOLIFIELD's statements appeared in the Washington Star on January 29:

CANAL AND ATOM

Representative HOLIFIELD, of California, has voiced a good and knowing word of caution regarding talk about building a sea-level Atlantic-Pacific canal to replace, or supplement, the one in Panama. The talk puts special stress on the idea of using nuclear explosives to bring the projected waterway into being at bargain-basement prices.

There is little doubt, of course, that such a project will have to be undertaken in the years immediately ahead. The prospective increase in seagoing commercial traffic and the larger dimensions of our new warships plainly indicate that the controversial Panama Canal is already obsolescent. As a result, it faces a future in which it will play only a secondary and constantly diminishing role.

As for the new sea-level canal, a prime question has to do with the problem of digging it. Atomic devices could make the job relative easy and inexpensive, but the limited test-ban treaty constitutes an obstacle. This is so because the treaty—which, of course, excludes underground detonations—commits every signatory "not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, at any place under its jurisdiction or control."

Mr. HOLIFIELD, former chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Committee and one of America's most educated men in the nuclear field, feels certain that this commitment would rule out an atomic-dug canal unless the detonations could be so masked as to avoid fallout or some special agreement could be worked out with the other signatories—particularly the Russians—to permit the use of nuclear explosives for peaceful

purposes. Without such an agreement, or the masking possibility, the task of nonatomic excavation would be costly in the extreme.

In that respect, the possibility of building a new canal in Panama, or Colombia or Mexico, will remain problematical unless or until the Russians take an affirmative view of it. Always, alas, we must reckon with their nay-saying and studied procrastination.

**Maine Fishing Industry Cannot Take
Tariff Slash and Survive****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, New England is disturbed at the prospect of reductions in tariffs on fisheries products.

Yesterday I submitted a brief to the U.S. Tariff Commission expressing my strong opposition to such a move.

At a time when Congress should be taking steps to immediately help the domestic fishing industry replace obsolete fishing boats and rehabilitate the commercial fishing industry in the United States, it is no time to harm further this beleaguered industry.

An editorial from the Portland, Maine, Press Herald, should be of interest to the Members of this House:

**MAINE FISHING INDUSTRY CANNOT TAKE
TARIFF SLASH AND SURVIVE**

If world trade could be fashioned on textbook principles, with each nation producing the manufacturers and other goods for which it was best fitted to do by economic reasons, we would not have protective tariffs and quotas and other barriers to the free flow of trade.

And we would not have Commissioner Ronald Green of Maine Sea and Shore Fisheries, and President Roderick Littlefield of the Associated Fisheries of Maine, forced to travel to Washington and protest, as they will today before the U.S. Tariff Commission, a proposal to cut in half existing duties on imports of fish products into this country.

There is a vast difference, we have always felt, between fishing and the making of automobiles and chemicals and paper and machinery and a thousand other manufactures. Like the farmer, the fisherman is not the master of his destiny. The sea is, at the same time, a friend and an implacable enemy. And if it may be claimed that every nation's fishermen experience maritime hazards, all the way from screaming North Atlantic gales to the mysterious ground-fish migrations that make the occupation a costly gamble, this is only part of the story.

The New England industry, in particular, is faced by higher boat costs, higher wages, higher insurance rates, and higher operating and processing costs, than any of its foreign competitors. Present tariff protection is barely adequate, and the current low rate of income to Maine fishermen is reflected in the depressed economic situation of dozens of seacoast towns.

These are the harsh facts of life that Commissioner Green and Mr. Littlefield will relate to the Tariff Commission today. If the United States must horsetrade tariff rates with Western European countries at Geneva in May, let's not bargain away the virtual livelihood of New Englanders who are barely making a living from the sea—and often at great cost.

**Should National Brand Merchandise Be
Sabotaged To Promote the Sale of
Private Brand Merchandise?****EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. CHET HOLIFIELD**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, three recent articles in Home Furnishings Daily point up the contradictions inherent in the chief arguments made by opponents of the quality stabilization bill.

One article, on January 14, 1964, relates to a large national mass merchandiser's reliance on the use of private brand names in merchandising its products. According to the president of Montgomery Ward & Co., Mr. Robert E. Brooker, that company will this year rely on private label brand names for 90 percent of its total sales.

Along the same line, another story in the same edition of Home Furnishings Daily tells of the National Association of Mass Merchandisers adoption of a so-called certified quality program "to enable member-discount organizations to carry a limited number of approved store-branded items."

And in the January 28 issue of the same publication, a top-level spokesman for the May Co. department store chain states that between 5-10 percent of May's total volume—estimated at \$720-725 million in fiscal 1963—is now produced by exclusively branded goods.

Says Mr. Lincoln Gries, executive vice president of the May Co.: With our own brand we can protect our profit, we have seen too many nationally-branded items get footballed. Also we find we can develop prestige for our own products on a local basis.

To my mind, these articles are prime exhibits substantiating the case of those of us who advocate quality stabilization legislation. Here, from their own lips, we hear admissions by mass merchandising spokesmen that the brand name on manufactured goods is a valuable asset to its producer and an invaluable guide to the modern American consumer. As Mr. Roger Courtland of the NAMM is quoted as saying, brand name products have "better consumer acceptance," and are considered quality products.

That is exactly the principle upon which the case for quality stabilization rests. And there is yet another important question to consider about these admissions by leading national mass merchandisers. As manufacturers of label goods, do they not possess the same control over the retail price of these goods which they seek to deny their independent competitors by opposing quality stabilization? Is it logical or fair to raise straw price-fixing charges against independent manufacturers and retailers when they ask only to be permitted equal treatment with Montgomery Ward, NAMM members and others who manufacture and market their own private

A398

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

January 31

label goods at prices which they determine?

These are questions to be considered in weighing the relative merits of arguments for and against quality stabilization—and I believe their answers clearly weigh in favor of proponents of the bill.

With unanimous consent I ask that two of the articles referred to be placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And I would ask all those interested in preserving a free, independent retail system to read these articles and reflect on their true meaning to the Nation's economy.

The articles follow:

[From Home Furnishings Daily, Jan. 15, 1964]

WARD'S PLANS STEP UP OF PRIVATE LABEL LINES
CHICAGO.—Montgomery Ward & Co. plans to step up its percentage of private label merchandise this year.

"Eighty percent of our total sales now are accounted for by goods which are offered under our brand name," according to Robert E. Brooker, Ward's president, "and this will be increased to approximately 90 percent in 1964."

Mr. Brooker also noted, in a lengthy progress report to the chain's employees, that Ward's had given great attention to packaging of goods under its various private labels the past year. Buyers and designers concentrated on developing label information which encourages customer self-selection and on designing attractive packages which encourage impulse purchases.

Ward's house labels include Signature appliances, Airline home entertainment equipment and Power-Kraft tools; Carol Brent, Miss Brent, Brent, Brent University, Brent Junior, Brentshire, Brentshire Young Junior, Brent Prep, and other labels for women's, men's, and children's apparel; and Style House and other brands for curtains, draperies, and fabrics.

Mr. Brooker also introduced a sad note in his statement.

"We have made few organizational and systems changes in the catalog portion of our business during 1963," he said, "and I regret to report that we have not kept pace with competition. While catalog industry sales have increased 9 percent, our sales through the various catalog forms of selling have advanced an estimated 2 percent through December. Consequently, we have lost position—our share of the market has declined."

Mr. Brooker went on to say that Ward's has experienced people "to compete favorably in catalog selling, and this important part of our total sales deserves the attention of each unit manager to assure recovery of our lost position."

Elsewhere in his statement, the official reported that early results of Ward's conversion of the Fair Store in northwest suburban Mount Prospect (Randhurst shopping center), Ill., have "exceeded our expectations." It gave Ward full-line retail representation in the Chicago market.

The newest timetable for conversion of four other units calls for completion by next September. Stores in Evergreen Park and Oak Park will be changed to Ward's prior to Easter, State Street by mid-1964, and Old Orchard in time for the back-to-school season.

The metropolitan district responsibility for the Chicago market includes stores in Gary and Hammond, Ind., and La Grange, Chicago Heights, Blue Island, Waukegan, Joliet, and Aurora and all catalog stores within a 50-mile radius of downtown Chicago.

[From Home Furnishings Daily, Jan. 15, 1964]

NAMM ADOPTS PROGRAM TO OK STORE BRANDS
WASHINGTON.—The National Association of Mass Merchandisers has adopted a certified

quality program to enable member-discount organizations to carry a limited number of approved store-branded items.

So far, said Roger Courtland, NAMM executive secretary, the program covers a line of pharmaceuticals (vitamins and about 60 sundries). It is to be broadened gradually, usually by about one item per store department. As of now, no hard goods are included, but it is an area that may be explored.

Mr. Courtland said tests have proved the consumer favors a product bearing the store name and quality seal. He said this provided a brand name identity and store identification. Since quality is pretested and price is lower (because of avoiding manufacturer ad costs), the store has a higher profit factor and better consumer acceptance, Mr. Courtland declared.

The manufacturer who wants to participate in the NAMM store-brand program is required to have tests made of his product and two or three comparable name brand products at a testing lab acceptable to NAMM. The tests are required by NAMM, for participation, to show that the product's quality is as good as or better than the name brands. Price also must be lower than the brand name merchandise, but how much lower depends on the product and other circumstances.

Panama Canal: Time for Showing Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the San Diego, (Calif.) Union, with the heading as shown below:

[From the San Diego Union, Jan. 23, 1964]

LET'S SAY NO AND MEAN IT: TIME FOR SHOW OF STRENGTH

There is no gratitude in diplomacy. Panama virtually owes its existence as a free nation to the desire of the United States to build the Panama Canal.

Now, Panama is unhappy and talks loosely and grandiosely of assuming complete jurisdiction and operation of the canal to preserve the dignity of its independence.

We would be willing to wager that few of the people in the provinces of Panama are much concerned whether Panama's dignity is upheld, and that the discontent is largely if not all in the political centers.

The pretensions of small nations often are out of proportion to their importance. The factor in regard to the Panama Canal, other than the safeguarding of American interests, is in the historic obligation of the United States to operate it as an international waterway, for the benefit of Panama and everybody else, as this country has done.

Panama is one of the smaller Latin countries. After the Spanish colonies in the New World had rebelled, Panama became a province of Colombia, then known as New Granada. It never was more than a province, though it did enjoy some measure of autonomy at times, until the United States—and the commercial world—felt the great need of a waterway through the Isthmus.

When the United States and Colombia were unable to reach agreement on a treaty, Panama broke away and signed up, and the canal was built. That was in 1903. Ever since, the canal has been an important factor in the economy of Panama.

But the child has become a diplomatic delinquent. Violence is substituted for commonsense and reason.

We believe it is a time for a show of strength in Panama as well as elsewhere. This is not being imperialistic. The United States wants no territory, nor does it want to destroy the integrity of any country.

But the United States invested money in Panama, and built the canal and opened it to all, in good faith and in confidence that Panama too would meet its treaty obligations. It is Panama, not the United States, that would change the rules of the game.

Panama wants to turn back the clock and abrogate the treaty that brought it independence. Does it also want to go back 60 years to its former state as a captive Province of Colombia?

We ought to close the door, probably, in mentioning the phrase "gunboat diplomacy." But, in truth, we are practicing "gunboat diplomacy" in many parts of the world, in the Formosa Straits, for example, and now in the Indian Ocean.

The 7th Fleet is sending a powerful task force into the Indian Ocean, and you can be sure there will be howls of protest from Indian Socialists and others. But a show of strength, if it keeps the peace, is better than the use of force.

The United States has kept the peace in the Western Pacific. We feel the Navy can maintain the peace in the distant Indian Ocean area. The national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Joseph J. Lombardo, now has suggested we establish a naval patrol between Red Cuba and the Panama Canal. This would seem a wise precaution. Fidel Castro will make the most of the situation in Panama.

Even more important than a show of force, at this moment, is a show of determination. Say "No" and show we mean it.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a tribute of sympathy from the Second District Democratic Club, Baltimore County, to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, upon the loss of her beloved husband, the late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. It is a tribute which expresses the feelings of all American citizens upon the untimely death of President Kennedy. It is with great pride, and a joining of my own personal sympathy with that of the Second District Democratic Club, that I insert the club's official resolution of sympathy in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is my high privilege, as well, to transmit an official copy of this resolution, under the seal of the club and signed by the club president in the name of all the members, to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy.

The resolution follows:

Whereas it is with profound regret and the deepest sorrow that the Second District Democratic Club, Inc., records the untimely demise of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States of America, on November 22, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three; and

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2015

REPORT ON FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY
DISPOSED OF

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, on foreign excess property disposed of, during calendar year 1963; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON OVERPRICING OF CERTAIN SHIP
PROPULSION BOILERS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the overpricing of ship propulsion boilers purchased under fixed-price contract NObs-76301 negotiated with Foster Wheeler Corp., New York, N.Y., Department of the Navy, dated January 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON FINAL SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF
CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the final settlement of the claim of *The Klamath and Modoc Tribes, et al., petitioner v. The United States of America, defendant* (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON ADMISSIONS OF REFUGEES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, reporting, pursuant to law, on the admission of refugees-escapees, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1963 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the 14th Islandwide Mandatories' Council To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, of Naha, Okinawa, signed by Eiharu Nakamura, Seikyu Nakayama, and Ibi Nakamoto, vice presidents, relating to the payment of damages sustained by the people of the Ryukyu Islands prior to the effective date of the peace treaty with Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A radiogram from the States-General of Holland, signed by Jonkman, President of the First Chamber, and Vanthiel, President of the Second Chamber, expressing thanks for the congratulations expressed on the 500th anniversary of that Parliament; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The memorial of Mrs. Arthur M. Powell, of Deming, N. Mex., remonstrating against scientific experimentation on living animals; ordered to lie on the table.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN BEEF—
CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF
SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I present a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to investigate the importing of foreign beef looking to limiting the quantity allowed to enter the country and to improving the quality of that which does reach our markets.

I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Com-

mittee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 562

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to investigate the importing of foreign beef looking to limiting the quantity allowed to enter the country and to improving the quality of that which does reach our markets

Whereas the raising of cattle for beef purposes has increased in all parts of the State during recent years in such proportion that it has now become one of the major factors in our agricultural economy and produces a sizable part of the farm income; and

Whereas the general assembly is informed that this important segment of our economy is seriously threatened by the influx of large quantities of imported beef which is far below the standard that is demanded of local producers; and

Whereas a large part of the imported beef is produced in distant lands where living standards and labor standards are low and the scale of wages is still lower; and

Whereas these facts make fair competition impossible, and places our cattle industry at a distinct financial disadvantage which is felt throughout the entire business structure of the State; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that the adverse effect which this import is having in South Carolina has reached other areas of the United States, and at a time when the President of the United States has voiced a determination to improve business conditions throughout the Nation and has made a general declaration of war against poverty throughout the length and breadth of the land; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that attention should be given to this important problem by the Congress and that stricter regulations should be imposed and serious consideration should be given to limiting the annual introduction of foreign beef into the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress is memorialized to investigate the importing of foreign beef into the United States looking to limiting the quantity allowed to enter the country, and to improving the quality of that which does reach our markets; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress, to each of the U.S. Senators from South Carolina, and to each member of the delegation from South Carolina in the Congress of the United States.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S. 2394. A bill to facilitate compliance with the convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed August 29, 1963, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 868).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 2493. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to determine that certain costs of operating and maintaining Banks Lake and Potholes Reservoir on the Colum-

bia Basin project for recreational purposes are nonreimbursable; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 2494. A bill to amend section 1245 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in order to limit application of that section in the case of the sale of an entire business or farm; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PELL:

S. 2495. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to permit injured employees entitled to receive medical services under such act to utilize the services of podiatrists; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTION

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF THE SENATE ON A COMPREHENSIVE, INSPECTED, TEST BAN

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as everyone knows, the disarmament negotiations reopened in Geneva on the 21st of January. Our representatives have returned to that city and will be striving conscientiously in the weeks and months ahead to build new agreements on the foundation laid by the limited nuclear test ban.

I welcome this continuation of effort. I realize the difficulties of the diplomacy involved in our search for mutually agreeable means of reducing tensions. And the problem is compounded because, I think, many people have assumed that the limited nuclear test ban treaty settled the underlying issues that prompted the original test ban talks.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The limited nuclear test ban was never intended as a substitute for our continually expressed desires for a comprehensive, inspected, test ban. Time after time during the negotiations and debate over the limited ban, the point was made by members of both parties, the administration, and even our Russian counterparts, that this was just a "first step." As the late President so aptly put it, "a journey of a thousand miles must start with one step." We have taken that step—but a long, hard march lies ahead.

In my judgment, the limited test ban agreement is valuable for many reasons, especially in reducing the amount of radioactive fallout in the atmosphere. But it lacks the vital ingredient of on-site inspections, which is the key to almost every meaningful proposal to curb the arms race.

Inspection is truly the sine qua non of any general disarmament agreement, and we cannot fail to pursue every possible avenue during the Geneva negotiations for steps that might make the world safer for future generations through verifiable arms control agreements.

At the same time, as we continue to seek methods whereby the principle of inspection can be established, we ought to be willing to consider any and all means of reducing tensions, as long as U.S. security is not imperiled. For instance, the "hot line" agreement required no inspection; it is self-inspecting. It also is mutually advantageous. We must remain ready and willing to conclude further agreements of this type should the opportunity arise.

2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 5

If I am not mistaken, this is the approach presently being made by the distinguished Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Mr. William Foster.

In the near future, I plan to make a few suggestions which I hope might help contribute to the Geneva discussions and perhaps open the way for further progress on the long, difficult journey.

At the same time that we explore possible tension-reducing proposals, I hope our negotiators will make every possible effort to advance the critically important and vital suggestions made by President Johnson in his message to the conference on January 21, 1964. These included a verified freeze on nuclear delivery vehicles, a verified cutoff in the production of fissionable materials for weapons use, and a verified ban on all nuclear weapons tests. I am sure that my colleagues share in my support of the full and complete exploration of all those topics.

As a means of indicating our support of the disarmament negotiations and our continuing search for a comprehensive ban with adequate inspection and safeguards, I now introduce for appropriate reference a resolution embodying that support and our high resolve to continue seeking steps which will help reduce the threat of war.

I have been joined in this resolution by 19 of my distinguished colleagues, Senators HUMPHREY, BARTLETT, BURDICK, CLARK, DOUGLAS, GRUENING, HART, HARTKE, INOUE, LONG of Missouri, MCCARTHY, METCALF, MOSS, MUNDT, NELSON, NEUBERGER, PROXMIER, RANDOLPH, and YOUNG of Ohio, and was happy and proud to welcome as principal cosponsor the distinguished chairman of the Disarmament Subcommittee, the senior Senator from the State of Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I hope that this resolution will gain more cosponsors and will go on to be overwhelmingly approved by this body.

For this reason I ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie on the table for sponsorship until Tuesday, February 10, and that the text of the resolution be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

In this way we can give the first indication since the limited nuclear test ban treaty of our support for moves toward a relaxation of tensions within the context of complete U.S. security.

We must not falter in our attempts to pursue peaceful solutions for a world in conflict. And yet, we must not be lulled into a false sense of security by those hopeful moves already made. This is difficult to do, but President Johnson has given us the rallying cry. Under President Kennedy we began—now let us continue.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the Record, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The resolution (S. Res. 295) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Whereas a limited nuclear test ban treaty has been signed by the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and more than 100 other nations; and

Whereas the response to the nuclear test ban treaty indicates that the United States is joined by many other nations in a desire for progress toward the lessening of international tensions and a cessation of the arms race; and

Whereas negotiations have now been resumed at the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference at Geneva to explore possible further steps toward these goals; and

Whereas the United States, through the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Department of Defense, and other governmental agencies, has undertaken extensive study, research, and discussion of various measures designed to help achieve these goals, with emphasis on the requirements for verifying compliance with such measures; and

Whereas on January 21, 1964, the United States proposed to the Geneva Conference the prompt exploration of certain of the measures so studied, such as a verified freeze on nuclear delivery vehicles, a verified cutoff in the production of fissionable materials for weapons use, and a verified ban on all nuclear weapons tests; and

Whereas effective verification, including inspection and control, is a necessary condition to any agreement on such measures in order to preserve the security of the United States and its allies and to provide adequate safeguards against the risks of agreement violations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the U.S. representatives to the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference at Geneva be encouraged and supported (1) in their insistence, despite past Soviet intransigence, on adequate verification of compliance and establishment of the principle of inspection and control and (2) in their efforts to negotiate agreements on measures such as those suggested in the President's message to the conference on January 21, 1964, provided that the arrangements for verification of compliance with such agreements are fully adequate to preserve the security of the United States and all other signatory nations against the risks of violation.

REVENUE ACT OF 1964—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 413)

Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DODD, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. RANDOLPH) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 8363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MILLER submitted an amendment (No. 414), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8363, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MILLER (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER) submitted an amendment (No. 415), intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 8363, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. JAVITS) submitted an amendment (No. 416), intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 8363, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KEATING submitted and amend-

ment (No. 417), intended to be proposed by him to House bill 8363, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that on February 3, 1964, the Senate received the nominations of Mr. W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., of Georgia, to be Ambassador to the Dominican Republic; Mr. William Attwood, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to Kenya; and Mr. James D. Bell, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador to Malaysia.

I further announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Mr. Robert G. Barnes, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to Jordan.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 2490

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on Tuesday, February 11, will open hearings at 10 a.m. in room 4232, New Senate Office Building, on legislation introduced on February 3, S. 2490, by the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

On that date, the subcommittee will be pleased to receive testimony from the sponsor of the bill and other Senators who may wish to be heard and from administration witnesses. The hearings would then be recessed for a short period of time to permit other interested agencies or organizations to review the bill and the testimony developed. It would be my hope that the hearings could be continued before the end of February in order that the subcommittee in executive session could meet on this and other education legislation early in March.

I cordially invite organizations and individuals having an interest in S. 2490 and the comparable provisions of S. 580 who may wish to amplify testimony already given by them before the subcommittee in the light of this development to indicate their desire to be heard or to file statements with the subcommittee to do so by calling the staff of the committee on extension 5375 or by writing me as chairman of the subcommittee, addressing their communications to room 4230, New Senate Office Building, the address of the committee. Those who so express an interest will be advised at a later time of the date and time of the resumed hearings.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, address, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows: